

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, and 16 are amended herein. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the claims as originally filed. Reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102:**

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by WIPO Publication No. 95/31775 to Craycroft et al. (hereinafter "Craycroft"). The rejection is traversed to the extent it would apply to the claims as amended. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

The second clause of claim 1 recites:

A controller, to be instructed by a multi-processing operation system to execute a plurality of application programs using respective different memory regions.

Craycroft neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "a controller, to be instructed by a multi-processing operation system to execute a plurality of application programs using respective different memory regions," as recited in claim 1. In Craycroft, rather, the application supplies the variable parameters such as the location of the window on the desktop interface and, perhaps, the colors and/or fonts to be used for the text and/or figures in the window. In particular, as described at page 3, lines 22, 23, and 24:

As one can imagine, the window definitions can include a large amount of data and, therefore, can require a large amount of memory for each definition.

Since, in Craycroft, the application supplies the variable parameters such as the location of the window on the desktop interface, Craycroft has no "controller, to be instructed by a multi-processing operation system to execute a plurality of application programs using respective different memory regions," as recited in claim 1.

The window definitions in Craycroft, moreover, include a large amount of data and require a large amount of memory for each *definition*. In particular, as described at page 3, lines 24, 25, and 26:

As one can imagine, the window definitions can include a large amount of data and, therefore, can require a large amount of memory for each definition.

Since the window definitions in Craycroft include a large amount of data and require a large

amount of memory for each definition, Craycroft has no “controller, to be instructed by a multi-processing operation system to execute a plurality of application programs using respective different memory regions,” as recited in claim 1.

Craycroft, moreover, wants to provide a consistent *appearance* between objects drawn on the desktop by different applications, not “execute a plurality of application programs using respective different memory regions,” as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described at page 3, lines 27-31:

In addition to the amount of memory used to create non-standard window definitions, another problem with this conventional method of providing variety of appearance in the graphical user interface is the lack of a consistent appearance between objects drawn on the desktop by different applications.

Since Craycroft wants to provide a consistent appearance between objects drawn on the desktop by different applications, Craycroft has no “controller, to be instructed by a multi-processing operation system to execute a plurality of application programs using respective different memory regions,” as recited in claim 1.

In Craycroft, moreover, users to run multiple applications each of which has its own *window* on the desktop, not “execute a plurality of application programs using respective different memory regions,” as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described at page 3, line 1, continuing at page 4, lines 1 and 2:

With multitasking i.e., multiple applications running simultaneously on a desktop, it is now common for users to simultaneously run multiple applications each of which has its own window on the desktop.

Since, in Craycroft, users run multiple applications each of which has its own window on the desktop, Craycroft has no “controller, to be instructed by a multi-processing operation system to execute a plurality of application programs using respective different memory regions,” as recited in claim 1.

Craycroft, finally, shows customized user *interfaces* provided in a consistent and switchable manner in Fig. 4. In particular, as described at page 7, lines 26, 27, and 28:

An overview which summarizes how these types of customized user interfaces can be provided in a consistent and switchable manner begins with a discussion of Figure 4.

Since Craycroft shows customized user interfaces provided in a consistent and switchable

manner in Fig. 4, Craycroft has no "controller, to be instructed by a multi-processing operation system to execute a plurality of application programs using respective different memory regions," as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 2-9 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-9 is also earnestly solicited.

Claims 10-15:

The fourth clause of claim 10 recites:

Wherein said computer is provided in a mobile terminal and is instructed by a multiprocessing operating system to execute a plurality of application programs using respective different memory regions.

Craycroft neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "wherein said computer is provided in a mobile terminal and is instructed by a multiprocessing operating system to execute a plurality of application programs using respective different memory regions," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 10 is thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 11-15 depend from claim 10 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 11-15 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11-15 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 16:

The fourth clause of claim 16 recites:

Wherein said computer is provided in a mobile terminal and is instructed by a multiprocessing operating system to execute a plurality of application programs using respective different memory regions.

Craycroft neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "wherein said computer is provided in a mobile terminal and is instructed by a multiprocessing operating system to execute a plurality of application programs using respective different memory regions," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 16 is thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 is earnestly solicited.

Application Serial No. 10/647,328  
Amendment filed February 26, 2009  
Reply to Office Action mailed December 23, 2008

**Conclusion:**

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 1-16 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance of all claims 1-16 and of this entire application is therefore respectfully requested.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing this Amendment, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 26, 2009

By: /Thomas E. McKiernan/  
Thomas E. McKiernan  
Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501